

23 11. (Five Times Amended) A method of monitoring the operational status of components in a computer comprising the acts of:

generating a notification about the status of at least one component in the computer, said notification comprising a first code which contains data about said component, said first code having a first data length;

receiving said notification unfiltered at a remote computer;

allowing a user to selectively disable or enable automatic display of said notification by selecting or deselecting a corresponding notification type in a graphic display; and

transforming said notification into an automatically displayed user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein said second data length is significantly greater than said first data length.

23 20. (Five Times Amended) A method of monitoring the operational status of components in a computer comprising the acts of:

providing a management information base which is configured to associate a plurality of indexes with different operational parameters related to said components;

generating at least one alert, said alert providing information about a change in an operational parameter in at least one component, said alert comprising one index of said indexes which identifies at least one of said operational parameters;

receiving said alert unfiltered from the computer;

allowing a user to selectively disable or enable automatic processing of said alert by selecting or deselecting a corresponding alert type in a graphic display; and

transforming said index in said alert into an automatically displayed user-friendly display message.

27 23. (Four Times Amended) A method of displaying a system management user interface comprising the acts of:

providing at least one computer having a plurality of components;

generating a plurality of alerts, said alerts associated with the monitoring of status information about said plurality of components;

displaying said alerts on a manager computer;

allowing a user to select at least two of said alerts; and

Appl. No. : 08/943,356
Filed : October 1, 1997

disabling or enabling the automatic display of said selected alerts to the user in response to a single command from the user, said single command corresponding to a deselection or selection of an alert type in a graphic display by said user.

REMARKS

By this paper, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 11, 20, and 23. Applicant has neither added nor canceled any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-38 remain pending for examination.

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Najjar for taking the time to conduct an interview with the undersigned attorney on December 6, 2001. With the claim amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicant has endeavored to address the concerns of the Examiner as expressed in the Office Action and during the interview.

The specific changes to the amended claims are shown on a separate page attached hereto and entitled **MARKED UP VERSION OF CLAIMS**, which follows the signature page of the Amendment. On this page, the insertions are underlined while the **[deletions are bold, in brackets]**.

I. Discussion of Rejection of Claims 1-38 Under Obviousness-type Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-38 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-25 of copending Application No. 08/942,005. The Examiner noted that a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) may be used to overcome the provisional rejection provided that the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application.

In response, Applicant is willing to submit a terminal disclaimer, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c), with respect to copending Application No. 08/942,005, after the provisional rejection becomes final and the pending claims are otherwise considered allowable.

II. Discussion of Ownership of the Invention for Purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 102(f), (g)

Citing 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, the Examiner noted that, since the application names joint inventors, Applicant must point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art.